

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 15:14:29 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #265
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 27 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 265

Today's Topics:

 around....around.....around....around.... (2 msgs)
 ARRL and it's members (4 msgs)
 ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)
 ARRL opposes temporary permits (2 msgs)
 Call sign snobbery
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Jul 93 20:01:07 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: around....around.....around....around....
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gganderson@augustana.edu (Kevin Anderson -7325)
writes:

>Either way I can't afford equipment. Some speak of young people
>not having funds. Well, I am not that young or that old, but
>I certainly don't have funds either. So right now I have to
>settle for the license.

Kevin,

Thanks for the opportunity to speak out on an issue more directly
related to my real job: things technical. :-).

Ham radio doesn't have to be expensive! The various ham magazines have been publishing simple, homebrew circuits that one can put together for a few dollars. These are only a few watts, and not up to the performance of the modern kilobuck transceiver, and are mostly CW (PLEASE, DON'T FLAME ME TO ASH -- I AM A BIT TOASTY OF LATE), but can be easily put together and used for real contacts.

There are also quite a few transmitter, receiver and transceiver kits around for not a whole lot more money.

Try the following files from info@arrl.org :

send KITS
send CONSTRUCTION-B

The first is a list of kit suppliers and the second is a bibliography of simple QST construction articles. I can also recommend two of our books "QRP Classics" and "Low-Profile Amateur Radio." Contact ARRL for more info about our products.

Good luck, and have fun with radio,
73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 16:53:56 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
bradley.bradley.edu!augustana.edu!gganderson@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: around....around....around....around....
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Golly, when I queried this newsgroup last spring, it was talk/talk/talk on the code v. no-code issue. It nearly turned me off to seeking a license. Well now I am waiting for my Novice ticket to come in the mail, and all I hear is the same talk/talk/talk (or is it talking?). Put it to rest! I hated the flame war then, and I still don't like it. It turns people

off to the hobby.

Why novice for me? Because I wanted to since high school in the 1970s, but didn't then, so I wanted to now. Yeh, code was hard (I won't say to anyone its easy), but that was the rules I needed for novice HF privileges -- which is an INTERNATIONAL rule by the way, not something the U.S. can just change. Why HF? I am also a shortwave fanatic, and 40m CW actually appeals to me as it did 20 years ago.

Why not no-code? For the longest time I couldn't see an appeal or reason for me to be on 2 meters. Talking into an HT for local conversation didn't make sense to me (just stating my impression, not for flame purposes), and with Internet at work, I get enough of packet. But now I do want a Tech/General/Advanced upgrade. Why change the of mind? So I can be useful in PUBLIC SERVICE like storm spotting, flood/hurricane help, MARS -- just that and nothing more. I want to make something more of hobby and talents other than burn energy and generate radio waves. That, and learn more radio theory.

Either way I can't afford equipment. Some speak of young people not having funds. Well, I am not that young or that old, but I certainly don't have funds either. So right now I have to settle for the license.

Let's just put these arguments to rest. Each of us have reasons for chosing the license level we desire or need. As long as we put that license to good use, then we should be content.

Now, can anyone help me put activity back on the Novice 220 band? I hate to see that go to waste.

Kevin

Date: 27 Jul 93 09:30:39 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

>I think the ARRL has done good and bad.... The biggest problem is
>that it looks like we're stuck with a 1 party system. A little
>competiton usually helps both sides improve their quality of service.

Well, you can always give your Division Director some competition in the next election. :-).

>as news today in the PD since the Press is long gone. I think a little
>good old-fashioned competition might just be the answer.

Well, we always have Wayne Green! :-)(:-.

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

Date: 27 Jul 93 09:17:09 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In [rec.radio.amateur.policy](#), floyd@nraeven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> I guess if you take a loose interpretation you could call it
>that... again though, it's just the kind of help I don't need! :)

This is a broad condemnation of a lot of things the ARRL does; I wonder if you could take the time to expand that a bit.

Are you telling me that we should not be conducting our EMI programs (Got an RFI problem? I will send you our free RFI package.), our Product Review, our Technical Information Service (Got a technical question? Send it to tis@arrl.org), our Product Reviews in QST? I really don't have time to go through the whole list, but don't necessarily condemn what you don't understand.

OTOH, we should be called to task for not taking the time to list

all of our benefits and services.

OTOOH, there may well be one or two major issues in which you think that we have acted against your best interests or desires. If so, you will get no argument from me if you feel that we are not worthy of your support because of those issues. Just please, try to realistically decide whether that one issue is big enough in your mind to overshadow what we have done well, or to preclude the possibility of your working to change the outcome.

I have found that most broad, sweeping condemnations are made by those who have little actual knowledge of what we do, have done, or have not done. I just had to say so.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen
RFT, xmtr and rcvr testing

Date: 27 Jul 93 09:34:59 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In `rec.radio.amateur.policy`, `robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)` writes:

>Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered
>around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL *is* the
>representative organization by and for the amateur radio community in
>the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support
>from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that
>a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all
>amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

>My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now
>have something completely different than what we approved?

Well, this proposal passed the ARRL Board of Directors. Unfortunately, it didn't pass the FCC. Contrary to popular rumor, the FCC does not always

jump exactly to the ARRL tune. I am not speaking with authority on this, and my opinion on the FCC's motives is pure conjecture, but I suspect that the FCC decided to take the path of least resistance and do what was easiest for the FCC: simplify the proposals into the one that was NOT a major restructuring of the Amateur Radio Service license classes. Considering that the idea had support from several quarters (the final version is quite similar to that proposed by the QCWA) made it all the easier.

In the final run, we did what our Board of Directors perceived that our members wanted, admittedly by a slim margin.

I suspect that Perry Williams, who works here at HQ but is NOT a regular reader of r.r.a., could expand on this quite a bit, possibly speaking with some authority on the reasons the FCC made their decision the way they did. I will pass your question along to Perry and see what kind of answer we get.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen
RFT, xmtr and rcvr testing

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 15:14:01 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!caen!uvaarpa!murdock!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!
jeg7e@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and it's members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1844@arrl.org> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:
>
>OTOH, we should be called to task for not taking the time to list
>all of our benefits and services.

This is certainly true.

I've directed prospective new Amateurs to email Luck Hurder asking for the New Hams packet which is supposed to include local testing session

information, etc... It was never received.

The same fellow persevered and obtained his license, then sent mail again requesting the Public Service Manual, again, it never arrived.

:)

I'm sure y'all are busy, but if you offer something, you should follow through. Of course, this fellow may never actually have sent the request, and lied to me, it's hard to tell.

-BUT- I wonder, to what extent does participation on the net conflict with the SIGNIFICANT revenue from publishing??? If a standard set of services were well organized and consistently offered by the ARRL on the Inet, would this cause a problem?

Email addresses should be noted in QST as well.

--

\\ / Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer | Amateur Radio - KD4CQY
\\/ Information Technology and Communications | -Will chmod for food-
\\/ The University of Virginia, Charlottesville | Hacker@Virginia.EDU
Any opinions expressed herein are not intended to be construed as those of UVA

Date: 27 Jul 93 09:03:10 EDT

From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net

Subject: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, ttolh@shell.portal.com (Todd Tolhurst) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:

>> Paraphrase -- <the ARRL shouldn't have a good internet connection>

>Ya just can't please some people.

>Keep upgrading your connectivity, ARRL. Some of us actually
>appreciate it, although it might be hard to discern that through
>all the habitual bitching.

As Jon Bloom explained, we will, just as soon as circumstances allow. I also plan on continuing the evolution of the server, up to whatever limit our phone connection will allow. Right now we are running MS-DOS machines with homebrew software and some of the software bugs make this a slightly unstable net platform. I really don't dare increase the

server activity by much until we get UNIX based along with a better connection and more complete service.

And we do know that both those who praise the ARRL as being able to do no wrong and those who claim that we do no right are off base by about the same amount. Most folks appreciate the ARRL for the good things and would like to change those things they think are not correct. I think we need both the praise and the criticism, so let 'em bitch; it really does us some good. :-).

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together
(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

Date: 27 Jul 93 10:23:31 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, flloyd@11-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:
>In article <1801@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, flloyd@11-a.west.sun.com
>(Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

[previous discussion of policy-by-poll deleted]

>I have to would say that (200,000) people forking out over \$30 a year
>for dues are slightly more than "disinterested". As a member, I'm
>essentially paying you to watch after my interests, and so far all
>you've said is that you're only willing to listen to me when I voice my
>opinion through an inefficient, bureaucratic old-boy network conduit.

That's not what I said. What I said is that the particular mechanism you want to use, issue-by-issue polling, is not, in my opinion, a good one. I also disagree with your characterization of the existing mechanism. It may be inefficient (representative democracy does tend to be so), but it is neither bureaucratic nor an old-boy network.

There is no bureaucracy standing between you and the policy makers of the League. (Unlike congresscritters, Directors don't have personal staff to open your letter and generate a form-letter reply.) And if the Board were an old-boy network, it wouldn't have the turnover it has.

>If the ballot postcard was in the magazine, perhaps adjacent to an accompanying article, one could conclude that the voters were >sufficiently informed.

Maybe, maybe not. You would be amazed how often I tell a caller, "Uh, we had an article that answers that question in last month's QST." And what would you do when we get only 500 responses (like with the much-maligned HF-auto survey of 1992)?

>>>I'll be the first to admit that I don't know who my local section >>>manager is. I didn't vote at all in the last local section election.

>>

>>Well, your Section Manager doesn't make policy, your Director does.

>>If you are too apathetic to even learn how to make your voice heard

>>in the existing system, why should anyone believe that you would

>>bother to inform yourself about issues before voting on them?

>

>If I were apathetic, then I wouldn't be writing this. What I'm >talking about here is access, which the ARRL has done nothing in >recent years to improve.

Demonstrably untrue, as witness our presence here on the net. More important, the Directors make a substantial effort to meet and talk with their constituents at club meetings and hamfests. And I know of no Director who will just ignore a reasoned argument, verbal or written. (That's not to say they'll *agree* with it.)

>Representative government was designed to >solve the problems of the 18th Century, when neither radio nor >telephones existed. Just because it's been in place for years >does not mean that it's necessarily the best way of doing it.

Representative government as practiced in this country was designed to solve several problems of earlier systems having mostly to do with human nature, not just to overcome the physical problems of communication and transportation in the 18th century (which, as any Briton will tell you, representative democracy predates). I don't want to burden the r.r.a.policy readership with a discussion of political science, but I'll be happy to take it off-line with you if you like.

In any case, I stand by my opinion that few amateurs have the time or the inclination to keep abreast of all the details of policy issues.

I know I don't, and I'm glad to be represented by someone who is willing to spend his time and effort doing so.

>>I quite agree that the level of participation in ARRL elections is
>>abysmal. But changing to a referendum system throws the baby out
>>with the bath water.

>

>Then how about a non-binding, advisory vote in which the results are
>published? After all, the people who make the decisions could use
>a dose of reality once in a while.

I think this argument exactly illustrates the problem here. You insist, on the basis of no discernable evidence, that the people making policy for the League do not grasp reality. Well, they do. They just don't always agree with your view of it.

>So in other words, I take it that your vote goes for not changing
>anything. Personally, I'm highly suspicious of any membership
>organization that chooses not to hear what the general members have
>to say directly.

Then I guess you are highly suspicious of pretty much every national membership organization extant. I'm certainly not aware of any that poll the members prior to taking each policy position.

>Calling us ininformed and apathetic as an excuse
>to deny us a direct vote speaks volumes for how the League must
>characterize its membership.

First, only *I* made that statement. My opinion no more characterizes the League's organizational view than your view represents *your* employer's. I dare say there are people working here at ARRL HQ who agree with your point of view. I just don't happen to be one of them. My opinions are just that: mine.

Second, I make my arguments from the available evidence, not from wishful thinking. The evidence is that, even when members are directly solicited to vote in elections, a large percentage don't bother. I characterize that behavior as apathetic. You may view it otherwise.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 16:32:18 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!

netcom.com!stevew@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL opposes temporary permits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22mh69INNn2s@west.West.Sun.COM>, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

> stuff deleted
> I don't think this issue has had enough exposure to the general
> ham population to warrant such a swift position by the league.
>
> Now I'm certain that there will be many which disagree with my opinions
> as stated above. Fine, I expect this. But it seems to me that the
> ARRL routinely makes influential decisions which affect hundreds of
> thousands of hams each year without asking us of our opinions.
>
> Why doesn't the ARRL take opinion polls? The very idea that we elect
> representative members to voice our opinions is anachronistic at best.
> Has the ARRL ever held a general vote of the membership? Why can't
> the ARRL poll its membership? Why does it continue to hold on to
> the decidedly disrepresentative method of governing?

The ARRL uses a representative system to operate. As a league member you get to vote for a Director once every two years. That director represents your interest on the BOD(which sets league policy) during his/her tenure.

As for "general polls" of the membership, yep they do. And we've had some interesting experiences along those lines. Remember the HF semi-automatic forwarding proposal? That opinion came about, and was justified by JUST such a poll. Nationwide, with a membership of 160,000 they got about 500 responses. The howl was heard from CA to Newington after that decision. Now tell me that "polling" works any better.

As for why the league "continues to hold on to the decidedly disrepresentative method of governing" well, I'd guess it's the same reason the U.S. Congress continues to operate in the mode they do. You don't have a direct say there last I looked ;-) Seems to be the same modus operandi for both organizations.

> I'll be the first to admit that I don't know who my local section
> manager is. I didn't vote at all in the last local section election.
> I don't think that it's possible for anyone other than myself to

The fact that you don't know who your SM is tells me two things. You don't quite understand the league structure, and consequently you don't know WHO to yell at. Your SM runs the ARES, OO program, Public Information system (for better or worse ;-), local ARRL club affiliation service, etc. The DIRECTOR is the person responsible for setting league

policy (as mentioned above) If you want to find out who that is(or fort that matter, who your SM is) look at page 8 of QST. You'll find both the Directors and all SM's listed there along with their address/phone numbers.

> represent my views when it comes to voting for change. There could
> not have possibly been a nominee who represented my views on all of
> the issues which might arise. Why then, should I compromise by voting
> for a candidate which possibly represented some of my views?

This also is a common problem with guys/gals in D.C. isn't it? You make your best choice and live with it for 2/4/6 years. Same is true with the way the league run's its' affairs. I don't agree with everything they do either, but then I get on the phone and yell at my director about once every two weeks too! To peraphrase the saying... you only get the government you deserve. If you don't take the time to find out what the folks stand for then you sure aren't going to get someone that represents the majority of your views!

> I would say that I'm not in the minority of members who do not vote
> under the current system. Given that the ARRL influences decisions
> which affect all hams, not just ARRL members, then one must conclude
> that as a group (hams) we are decidedly underrepresented. Let's assume
> (please prove me wrong) that 1 in 10 ARRL members vote in the section
> elections. Given that the ARRL represents about a third of all hams,

I can't give you numbers for section elections but can quote one set of numbers for my Division. The last Pacific division election had 2400 people cast votes for Director/Vice Director. There are roughly 10,000 people in the division so they comes out to 24%. So the numbers are a bit better than twice what you expected but obvious also reflect a fair level of apathy.

> then the voting population represents one thirtieth of all hams. And
> to top this off, this 1/30 group does not vote on issues at all. It
> votes for people who will decide the issues for them. If there were a
> general elections among all ARRL members, not only would the ordinary
> joe actually have a real vote on issues, but the actual representation
> in the process would increase by as much as an order of magnitude.

The numbers are slightly better than that but still pretty depressing. Again using the Pacific division numbers and back of the envelope calculations. In my Division there is roughly a 30% membership in the league with only 25% of them voting you are talking about 7% of the ham population actively participating in the system.

> It couldnt' be that difficult for the ARRL to hold general elections.
> I get mail-in ballots cards once a year from several companies for

> which I'm a stock holder. Presumably, as a [member] I'm a 'stock
> holder' in the ARRL too. I get numerous mailings from the League
> each year, how much could it cost them to do a mass ballot? I suspect
> that cost is not the issue, but rather the desire by those currently
> in power not to dilute their considerable influence by the whims and
> will of the unwashed masses.

See the above for the results of some such attempts. Apathy is the biggest problem no matter which approach you care to take.

>
> -fred
>
> [Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ Fred.Lloyd@west.sun.com]
> [Sun Microsystems, Systems Engineer]
> [Phoenix, AZ (602) 224-3517]

Steve KA6S

Date: 27 Jul 1993 13:49:03 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930723.162826.6t2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

> [drt wrote:]
>
> KK6JQ = 9+3+9+3+11+3+13+3+13+7 = 74 units long! No wonder you
> want to liberalize code requirements! :->

Hmmm... so lets see....
KD1NR = 9+3+7+3+17+3+5+3+7 = 57 units... not too bad.

Tony

Sorry, Tony.

KD1NR = 9+3+7+3+17+3+5+3+7+7 = 64 units.
(No word has an odd number of units.)

-drt

--

|David R. Tucker KG2S drt@athena.mit.edu|

|`Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except
|what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis |

Date: 27 Jul 93 16:05:53 GMT
From: furuta@MIMSY.CS.UMD.EDU
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1786@arrl.org| bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes:
[large portion deleted]
|
|When is it keyboarded? The 2nd to the last step in their [the FCC's]
|process--which
|is on a Tuesday (about five to seven weeks after they have received).
|
|What is the last step? Two days later (the same week, on that Thursday), the
|license is laser printed and mailed. You then receive it via first-class mail
|within the next few days.
|
|73,
|
|Bart J. Jahnke, KB9NM
|Manager
|ARRL/VEC

Bart, your message did an excellent job of explaining why it can take a VEC a significant amount of time to process a license application. Do you know what steps the FCC goes through once the license arrives in Gettysburg? It might help us gain a better appreciation of the reasons for the total wait time if you could describe that part of the process also.

--Rick
KE3IV

Date: 27 Jul 93 20:32:27 GMT
From: ogicse!news.tek.com!tekgen!brucec@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3465@tekgen.bv.tek.com>,
<1993Jul26.210916.13205@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>, <231orc\$s7m@ornews.intel.com>

Subject : Re: Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!

Thank you Jim for posting excerpts from the text of the ordinance!

In my original posting, I did say "ALL" amateur antennas, and it appears that is incorrect. I noticed that you didn't post the fee schedule, so I assume that my distillation of the fee schedule is correct.

These modifications, although better than the original, are still (IMHO) quite repressive. I sense from your post that you think these modifications make the ordinance satisfactory. Is this correct?

Bruce NI7M

Date: 27 Jul 1993 13:39:58 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul21.153450.28504@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<22pn2h\$40j@techbook.techbook.com>,
<1993Jul26.203352.5754@midway.uchicago.edu>ah.acn
Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

In article <1993Jul26.203352.5754@midway.uchicago.edu> hayward@cs.uchicago.edu (Kristin Rachael Hayward) writes:

>
>W5YI and the ARRL VEC are very different in regard to how they handle
>the backup paperwork. W5YI has the local examiner team keep the exams;
>the ARRL has all of it forwarded to Newington where, as Bart
>explained, they go over it with a fine tooth comb, and then they file
>it in case anyone complains.

>
>So, why is W5YI faster? Because they take the 610, make certain that
>the top is filled out correctly, stamp it and send it to the FCC.

>
>Why is the ARRL slower? They do a more thorough job and retain the
>paperwork. Now, is one approach right and one wrong?
>

Kristin has a point here. I am accredited with ARRL-VEC, W5YI-VEC and GLARC-VEC (Great Lakes ARC). We had many more problems with W5YI than we ever did with others. Not that they are bad, they are just set up differently. Now I mostly work with Jim Georgias, W9JUG, who lives a few miles from me and runs the GLARC-VEC. Awfully convenient.

Rajiv
aa9ch

Address: r-dewan@nwu.edu

Phone: None on HF. Only CW.

Look for aa9ch/m on bottom end of 10m-80m.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #265
